

Fire Connections Workshop

NPS Fire Education, Prevention and Information Specialists
February 24-28, 2003 Santa Fe, NM

Your Name (optional): _____

For each question, mark the number which best reflects your thoughts on the workshop.
Additional comments are welcome under each question.

(5=highest) (1=lowest)

I was satisfied with the overall workshop (5) (4) (3) (2) (1)
8 4

The workshop was well organized (5) (4) (3) (2) (1)
10 2

- Considering all the “issues” with the agenda – we done good!
- Great job!

The presenters and topics were appropriate (5) (4) (3) (2) (1)
8 4

- Good change from 1st 2001 meeting.

Time allotted for presenters appropriate (5) (4) (3) (2) (1)
4 6 2

- Some could have used more.
- Some were too long. Needed a few more breaks, 5-10 minutes.

Objectives of workshop sessions met (5) (4) (3) (2) (1)
8 3

The facilities were suitable (5) (4) (3) (2) (1)
11 1

- Major airport and dedicated shuttle(s) very helpful.
- They were great!
- Yeah!

Field trip appropriate and useful (5) (4) (3) (2) (1)
11 1

- Cerro Grande is a watershed event for many concentric circles...BAND/SW/NPS/Fire Community. Important for us outworlders to visit. Especially enlightening to hear from the kids, Tim, Craig, and Dean.
- Yes-even in the snow. Enjoyed the kids.

“Open Mike” sessions appropriate and useful	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
	9	2			

- Oh yeah. Thank you for including this as an agenda item. After class, sharing also done and important, but very good to build it in to the workday. The info itself, the shared concerns, the bonding.
- Yes – great to see what group is working on and the direction they are heading.
- These are very useful, and since we are so talkative, we might need to set aside more time. It seemed that we ran out of time for this.

Please turn page over for additional comment(s)
Evaluation, continued...

What were the strong points of the workshop?

- Logistics (ok, minus the flat tire...). Facility-has character. Open mike.
- Speakers, which were brought in. Interaction and participant contributions.
- All of the speakers were appropriate and each enhanced the workshop. I appreciated the overall objectives and intents sought after in the workshop. I thought was worked best were the allotted times for conversations, open mikes...
- Well organized. The interaction of all the FEPIS folks. The field trip (except for the weather). The section on fuels management and web sites.
- Programs from the other participants; lessons learned/success stories; great accommodations.
- We covered a variety of topics without belaboring them. Pace moved very well; there could always be more time for discussion, but where will it end?
- Very well organized. Useful sessions. Excellent facilities.
- Variety of topics. Using some of our own people as presenters.
- We know one another yet welcoming to new people. Good diversity of topics. Discussions great!
- Fuels overview program was valuable. The variety of speakers and topics were appropriate. Open mike – hearing what folks are doing.
- Facilities and organization.
- Field Trip – both Los Alamos school and Bandelier +BAND FMO led discussion. Fuels–presentation/discussion with John Segar. Future of Fire Information. Christina Green’s Evaluation of SCA Program. Open mike and presentations of Fire Ed activities in parks.

What were the weak points of the workshop and how would you change them for the better?

- From the cheap seats – what was visible to the participants – the workshop provided a number of important perspectives. In our “terrible twos” these are important and probably a matter of choosing amongst the many.
- Break at least 5 minutes every hour for bathroom.
- The firewise section was well known to me and I think most of us. More time needs to be spent on group discussions.
- Can’t think of one!
- It would be helpful to stick to breaks on the hour, especially just after a meal (1 ½-2 hours is a stretch).
- Not enough time for all the things we could have covered! However, we really can’t make the conference longer.
- Logistics-better communications.
- The overall program was useful and valuable. Too much sitting. Time – it is hard to keep on track. Thursday was too long. Would have liked to get out to explore Santa Fe before dark.
- I know that there are so many things we try to accomplish in these meetings so time is limited. But, I really enjoyed the few opportunities we had to have more open-ended discussions. We might be getting to the point that we can have fewer outside presenters and teach each other more.
- Interpretation Session – tangible/intangible, etc. Was not helpful/too basic; this session should have focused on fire interp/ed efforts/programs in parks outside FEPIS efforts. There is lots of this going on since we were in IMR this should have started with the obvious: YELL.

What were the most important things you learned from this workshop?

- Cerro Grande and open mike.
- Importance of Info/Ed efforts.
- Learned what others are doing and what worked and did not work for them. Comments from the speakers about the future.
- The value of utilizing your peers. The future of fire info.
- The projects going on in the service regarding fire education.
- Networking
- What other FEPIS are working on. Successes and failures. Trends in fire ed, prev. and info. More info about Cerro Grande.
- We’re still all pretty much at the same place in our positions – trying in some cases, to still define our priorities.
- How much our program has grown and developed already. Open mike.
- All of it was useful. Web connections, Inside NPS, Photo reviews. Good review of fuels. What other folks are doing. The workshop is exciting. We are doing some really cool things.
- What others are doing and web stuff!

- Scope of TNC/NFP/Partnership. Org. Structure of NRID/Fort Collins. Karen Wade interview/Cerro Grande.

What information would you seek in future workshops? (Should we have future workshops?)

- Current political realities/opportunities. Sharing projects, activities, challenges, etc. Legislation. Get an understanding of fire in that area. Perhaps alternate months Feb/Mar/Nov. Weather – apparently good times for most folks.
- Yes.
- Compiling info from all of us that works or highlights as an output.
- More “open mike” sessions. Fire ecology. Role of other agency info. officers.
- Still learning job req. – too new in position. Yes.
- Updates, new programs, breaking issues (i.e.- more of the same!) Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes, the continued networking is important.
- Should have future workshops. More discussion time about issues and how to solve with all our brainpower combined.
- More panels like future of information. Field trips into our parks and fire areas. Fire “experts” from Boise or regions to continue to keep us informed on current fuels and fire issues.
- Yes.
- Fire effects/fire research presentation(s) from regional and or national fire ecologist(s). NPS fire ecology program in general.

Other comments:

- I’ll take many things into my S-203 class next week. Especially Summerfield/Paxton/Frye. Currently 7 VA Dept. of Forestry, 5 USDA FS, 1 New Jerseyite, 11 NPS – NER, NCR, SER., from management assistant to front liners.
- My apologies for a rushed, not really fleshed out evaluation. A recommendation for next year, allow us to take home these evaluations and think about it. I will get back with you on all this in a few days after I think more about it.
- Great future success story.
- Thank you for a great week. Good job. I vote for Sequoia!
- Thanks to everyone involved in organizing committee!
- Some of what was presented about FEPIS work at parks should be presented at National FMO conference. One of our strategic objectives should be a “greatest hits” of FEPIS

group PowerPoint presented annually at National FMO Conference. Very concerned about the somewhat persuasive assumption that homeowners are our primary audience. The concept/audience of “communities” is much bigger than just homeowners. Organization, schools, businesses, leaders, etc. (Neil DeJong indicated this somewhat one-dimensional view of FEPIS. We need to address this with regional interpretation leads and COI’s) I think this relates to the also disconcerting questions about our grade level. There should be no question the fuel performance FEPIS is a GS-11. No one seems to question the fire ecologist or the fire GIS positions being GS-11. This is reflection of the broader undervaluing of interp/ed/info. By contrast public affairs specialists are typically no lower than GS-11. The lack of professional series is one issue that may be explored in the future. “Information and the Arts” or “Public Affairs Specialist” with a benchmark FEPIS PD seems viable. Having SCA’s volunteering to Fire Ed for \$50/week doesn’t help the perception that this work should be cheap. Two very important dialogues started that should be continued: - inventory/monitoring/research needs associated with “alternative” (non- Rx) fuels treatments. FEPIS raised voices from field regarding concerns that fire effects program isn’t sufficiently staffed/funded to deal with some of the ecological issues and questions raised with fuel treatments. – Ecosystem restoration versus air quality. Has there been DOI/EPA dialogue re: Rx relative to “Natural Events” policy for PM 2.5? In some circumstances could Rx be considered a simulated natural event? (Also, the case should be made that the big catastrophic fires many times are not entirely natural events due to fire exclusion history...condition class 3).